

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Gerhard Schanz  
Serial No.: 10/563,354  
Filed: 05/18/2006  
Group Art Unit: 1797  
Examiner: Katherine M. Zalasky  
Title: Extraction Process Using a Static Micromixer

**RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
Board of Patent Appeals and Interference  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed 12 January 2011. The Notice indicates that EVIDENCE and RELATED PROCEEDINGS pages were not submitted with the Appeal Brief filed 17 December 2010.

In response, Appellant submits herewith EVIDENCE and RELATED PROCEEDINGS pages as well as a revised TABLE OF CONTENTS page reflecting the addition of the pages omitted from the Appeal Brief filed 17 December 2010.

Respectfully Submitted  
/Michael J. Striker/  
Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 27233

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	3
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	3
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	3
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	4
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	7
<b>VII. ARGUMENTS</b>	
A. Claims 1-23:	
One of ordinary skill would have no doubt as to the metes and bounds of claims 1-23 or the meaning of "not in contact with." .....	8
B. Claims 1, 20, and 22	
1. The Examiner has not established, <i>prima facie</i> , that the artisan would have found the claimed invention obvious in light of the teachings of the cited references because the references, neither individually nor in combination, teach or suggest a linking channel that is divided once into more than two part channels. ....	11
2. The Examiner has not established, <i>prima facie</i> , that the artisan would have found the claimed invention obvious in light of the teachings of the cited references because the references, neither individually nor in combination, teach or suggest a linking channel	

comprising microstructure parts in contact with a mixing zone but not in contact with an inlet opening into the linking channel.....	14
3. The Examiner has not established, <i>prima facie</i> , that the artisan would have found the claimed invention obvious in light of the teachings of the cited references because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the static micromixer taught by Schubert according to the teachings of Ehrfeld. ....	18
C. ....	Claim
2.....	21
D. ....	Claim
3.....	21
E. Claim 4.....	22
F. Claim 5.....	23
G. Claim 6.....	24
H. Claims 7 and 8.....	26
I. Claim 9-12.....	26
J. Claims 11-13.....	27
K. Claim 14 and 15.....	28
L. Claims 16-18.....	28
M. Claims 18 and 19.....	29
N. Claim 21.....	30
O. Claim23.....	30
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	31
IX. CLAIMS INDEX.....	32
X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX.....	39
XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	40

**X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX:**

NONE

**XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX:**

NONE